REMARKS

I.   Introduction

Claims 1, 2, and 5-7 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 5 and 6 are cancelled. Consequently, claims 1, 2, and 7 are at issue. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

II.   The objections and rejections

Claims 5 and 6 were objected to as being dependent upon a cancelled claim. These claim objections are obviated for the reasons stated below.

Claims 1, 2, and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,872,905 to Ono. These rejections are traversed for the reasons described below.

III.   The prior art

Ono- only entire files are deleted

Ono relates to a memory storage system where complete computer files are deallocated from memory. As best seen in his FIGs. 4 and 5, the entire file 3 is to be deleted. As also can be seen, the entire file 3 is added to the empty list 68. In other words, only an entire file can be deleted in Ono. As such, there is no discussion of linking portions of files together—since only entire files can be deleted, linking of portions of these files is not needed.

IV.   The claims are allowable

Claims 5 and 6 are cancelled. Consequently, it is submitted that the claim objections are obviated.

The applicant's claims have been amended to recite storing a first file in a memory. The first file includes a plurality of individual sectors and is separate and self-contained from a second file stored in the memory. The plurality sectors of the first file are configured to be linked together and presentable to a user as a complete audiovisual presentation. The sectors are portions of the presentation and are of substantially the same size. A free memory list is

defined in the memory. The free memory list exclusively defines deallocated memory sectors the free memory list and is configured to vary in size over time.

A portion of the presentation is selected for deletion. The portion is smaller than the entire presentation and the beginning of the portion is marked with a first deletion point and the end of the portion is marked with a second deletion point. The selected portion that is marked by the first deletion point and the second deletion point is mapped to one or more of the sectors within the first file. The one or more mapped sectors are deallocated from the file and the deallocated sectors of the file are appended to the free memory list. The first file is amended to link the remaining sectors of the file together so that the presentation can be presented to the user continuously and without substantially any time discontinuities.

Support for these amendments is contained at, among other places, page 7, lines 13-page 8, line 30 of the specification.

In one advantage of the applicant's invention, various portions of separate audiovisual files can be deleted without taking up a lot of memory space and, at the same time, allowing the modified audiovisual file to be presented to the user without discontinuities in time. Some previous attempts required copying the entire file (representing a complete audiovisual presentation) to another portion of memory. In other previous approaches (such as in the case of Ono), sub-portions of files were incapable of being deleted.

With all due respect and as will be discussed in greater detail below, Ono does not teach or suggest at least the following elements recited in claim 1:

-   Self-contained and separate files that include sectors, which are similarly sized;
-   Mapping a deleted portion of an audiovisual presentation contained over multiple sectors of the file to one or more sectors of the file;
-   Marking the beginning of the to-be deleted portion with a first deletion point and the end of the to-be deleted portion with a second deletion point; and
-   After mapping and deleting the selected sectors, linking the remaining sectors together so that they can be presented without time discontinuities to a user.

More specifically, Ono does not teach the use of self-contained and separate files that include sectors, which are similarly sized as recited in claim 1. In fact, Ono does not describe any manipulation of any element that is less than a file in size. Moreover, files and sectors are not the same data elements. For instance, files may include complete audiovisual presentations while sectors cannot and will not contain an entire presentation. Even assuming for the sake of argument that the Ono's files are considered "sectors," these elements are not the same size as recited in claim 1. See FIG. 4 of Ono. Consequently, Ono can in no way be seen as teaching or suggesting this claim element.

In addition, Ono does teach or suggest mapping a portion of an audiovisual presentation to one or more sectors of a file also as recited in claim 1. To the contrary, Ono never discusses deleting portions of presentations and never discusses mapping presentation portions to sectors. Indeed, only complete files are deleted by Ono so there would be no reason to have any mapping.

Further, Ono does not teach or suggest marking the beginning of the to-be deleted portion with a first deletion point and the end of the to-be deleted portion with a second deletion point as recited in claim 1. To the contrary, the boundaries of Ono's files are fixed. Marking portions of these files is not permitted. In other words, a user can only delete fixed and unchanging files (e.g., from addresses 1 to 2000 but never from 1500 to 1700). Thus, not only does Ono not teach being able to mark a sub-file sector, Ono expressly teaches against making such a modification to his system.

Also, Ono does not teach or suggest that after the mapped sectors are deleted, the remaining sectors are linked together so that they can be presented without time discontinuities to a user as recited in claim 1. To the contrary and as mentioned, Ono only deletes entire files in his system. Thus, there is no reason to link sectors together in Ono since the entire presentation (including all sectors thereof) is always deleted.

Since at least one element of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Ono, it is submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ono. Claims 5 and 6 are cancelled. The remaining claims depend upon claim 1 and are not anticipated by Ono for the same reasons as claim 1.

V. Conclusion

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required in this application to Deposit Account No. 06-1135.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

By _____
Timothy R. Baumann
Registration No. 40,502

Date: 9/23/2010

120 South LaSalle Street, Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone: 312.577.7000
Facsimile: 312.577.7007